585 [684] probably by pricking himself, and will wipe it on the toga.

About two weeks after the wedding, the bride and groom take a lamb or a goat and go to spend a few days with the bride's parents. The Bedouin say that the relationship between the groom and his in-laws is extremely important. The man should treat his wife's mother and father as if they were his own. "When a man's father-in-law and mother-in-law come to visit him, he must slaughter a lamb for them. He must respect both of them. Remember, this man and woman are the grandparents of his children."

585 671 182 [574] [431] [782] *[613] The marriage, then, is only the first step in the ritualization of new group bonds established between the families of the bride and groom. Bonds are subsequently intensified through a process of visitation, gift-exchange and sacrifice. The most important factor linking the two groups is the actual presence of the bride in the midst of her husband's group, for she remains, in terms of the patrilineal principle, a member of her father's lineage. This is made perfectly clear by the fact that she is referred to, never by her name but, by the name of her tribal grouping if she is other than 'Aishaibi. If she is of the 'Aishaibat tribe, she will be referred to as bint of so-and-so. Hence the Bedouins stress the importance of extra-group bonds by referring to the women in their residence group as al-Qinaishiyya or al-Kamailiyya, for instance (-iyya is the Arabic feminine marker).

585 *613 551 571 182 [193]

593 As a girl in her father's household, the woman is under the direct authority of her father, who is responsible for her. When the father dies, this responsibility, as well as the authority, goes to her brother or her closest male kin in the order specified earlier. At marriage the [591] girl usually moves to live with her husband, and this subjects her to [606] his control and sometimes to that of his parents, if the couple lives with them. But the authority of the husband over his wife remains 593 secondary to that of her father. The woman's membership in her father's 594 household does not cease with marriage, and the strength of her relations to her kin is maintained by their frequent visits to her new residence and by her occasional visits to them. This right of visitation 593 cannot be denied by the husband who not only has to allow such visits, 594 but is also required to treat members of his wife's family, especially 606 her father, with great respect and hospitality. If the husband fails [586] to do so, the wife's father can order her to leave her husband and go back to his household with him.

This point is illustrated by the case of Muftah from the Esheibat tribe in the area of Matruh, whose older daughter is married to Hemeida from the Geneishat segment, which lives in the area of Fokah some 80 miles to the east of Matruh. One winter day in 1965, while passing near the area where his daughter lived, Muftah decided to pay her a visit. When he arrived, her husband was not at home; he was in the market in a nearby town selling sheep. When he came back late that evening, he greeted Muftah with the customary slaughter of a goat and invited the neighbors to the occasion. After dinner Muftah wanted to rest. It was a very hot night, so his son-in-law brought a rug and spread it outside the tent in the cool air. After that he retired to his tent where he spent the night inside.

spent the night inside. In the morning Muftah ordered his daughter to pack her clothes because she was to leave with him. He refused to give her husband any explanation as to why he was taking his daughter away. The husband could not prevent him from taking her away because, as he said, "He is her father and has the right to take her away with him at any time."

When the wife did not return for two weeks, her husband went to her father's house to take her, but her father refused to let her go. Hemeida then went to a religious man in the area and asked him to intervene in the matter and see why Muftah had taken away his wife. He also asked him to arrange a mi'ad with Muftah to discuss the matter.

The religious man was selected in this case because he was a close friend of Muftah and was believed to have influence over him. He was also known throughout the area to be fair and of sound opinion. It is important in the cases of disputes that the person selected as a mardi is known as a wise and fair man. It is only then that he is able to mediate between the two parties without being accused of taking sides. The religious men, members of the Murabiteen tribes in the area, by their relative position outside the formal tribal organization of the Sa'adi tribes, are the most likely candidates for such activity. Yet, this is not always the case. For this aspect of assumed impartiality is frequently balanced off by the fact that these religious men lack the support of a powerful tribal segment behind them. To be effective, the mardi has to be respected, not only for his personal qualities, but also for being a member of a respectable tribal segment whose power lends authority to the mardi's decision. This is not usually the case with the client tribes of Murabiteen. Wealth in many cases is also considered an important

792 Wealth in many cases is also considered an important
629 requirement for the selection of the mardi. This does not mean that
554 religious men in the area have no role in dispute settlement, for they
[556] do. It simply means that the mardi is selected according to a number of criteria that vary from case to case, and that in some of these cases sound wisdom and fairness characteristic of religious men are not enough basis for their selection as mardis. This means that the religious men have no special mediatory role based on their religious nature alone. In certain cases religious men offer the best possibility for mediation; in others, a non-religious person might offer a
[586] better chance for settling the dispute. In cases of women seeking
[556] divorce from their husbands, the wealth of the mediator, more than anything else, seems to determine the selection of the man whom the woman asks to negotiate on her behalf, a point to which I will return later in the chapter.

593 The Mi'ad was held in the house of Muftah. Present at the mi'ad
574 were Muftah, his son-in-law, Hemeida, the heads of households in Muftah's
606 camp (one of them was his brother and the other five were members of
586 different tribal segments), my driver (who was a member of the neighbor-
627 ing Sanagrah tribal segment), myself, and the religious man. After the
792 tea was served, the religious man said that the discussion should start. He reminded the gathering that this case is a family one and should not develop into a larger dispute. "After all, the daughter's husband is a son, and the case is actually a misunderstanding between a father and a son and should be viewed in that context." Then he turned to Muftah and said that in that spirit he was asking him why he had taken his daughter away from her husband. Muftah said that he had taken his daughter away

Muftah said that he had taken his daughter away
593 to punish Hemeida for what he thought was disrespectful behavior. He
574 then proceeded to descirbe how Hemeida, after bringing the blanket out
606 for Muftah, went inside and spent the night with his wife, defying the
586 basic rule of not showing intimacy in the presence of older people,
627 especially the parents or parents-in-law. For, to show such intimacy
792 is a sign of disrespect. He demanded that Hemeida pay him "kabara"
888 for his injured pride. The term kabara refers to the adjective "kebir"
[681] (lit. respected or big man). Kabara is the fine paid for belittling
[558] someone by word or deed. Muftah insisted that he would not allow his daughter to return to her husband until Hemeida had paid that kabara. Hemeida conceded the fact that intimacy constitutes an insult; but he insisted that his action did not constitute an act of intimacy with his wife, but was a matter of convenience and necessity, since he had only
593 two blankets, and the only one left was that inside the tent. Muftah
574 became angry and started shouting at Hemeida, who, in turn, started
606 shouting back; it became impossible to follow what was being said.
586 The religious man interfered in the discussion, trying to stop the argu-
627 ment between Muftah and Hemeida. The others attending the mi'ad also
792 [578] interfered. The religious man and two neighbors took Muftah outside the tent while Muftah's brother tried to calm Hemeida down. The other members of the group also calmed Hemeida, reminding him that he was the younger person and must be more tolerant of older people. They also reminded Hemeida that Muftah was his father-in-law and had the right to take his daughter away any time he chose. They urged him to "defeat the devil" [681] and to apologize to his father-in-law and pay him kabara. He seemed convinced but insisted that all he was going to pay was five pounds and a goat. Muftahh brother and one of the neighbors then left the tent and

593 went to see Muftah and his company. Half an hour later the religious
594 man came and took Hemeida aside and talked to him in a very low voice,
606 then left the tent again. A few minutes more had passed; everyone re-
586 turned to the tent; Muftah was not angry anymore. The religious man
627 read the fatha, or the beginning sura of the Koraan, then said that the
792 souls were now pure and that Hemeida was considered as a son of Muftah
[779] and that disagreements such as this should not alter the good relations between the two. He said that the devil had found his way into the souls of the two people, but now, thanks to God and the good people present, they both had come back to their senses. Hemeida then rose and went to where his father-in-law was sitting and shook hands with him. Then he
[581] handed the religious man ten pounds which the latter passed to Muftah and promised to send him a goat as a gift to his daughter. Muftah left the tent and went to the tent of the women. When he came back he announced that a goat had been slaughtered and that everyone was invited to eat. Everybody then left and Muftah promised to return his daughter to her husband the following day.

593 While the right of the father to take his daughter away from her
606 husband constitutes a check on the authority of the latter and insures
557 the wife good treatment by her husband and her in-laws, not infrequently
586 that right has been invoked for personal or individual interest on the
[429] part of the woman's father or her closest male kin. Several cases have been cited in the area where the father or guardian had invoked the right to force the husband to concede to certain demands of the wife's guardian, even when the wife objected to those demands or disagreed with her guardian. One of these is the case of Mabroka who is married to a distant

593 606 557 586

member of the same tribe. At the time that the dispute had occurred she had been married for fifteen years and had four children ranging in age from thirteen to two years. The husband possessed a piece of land on the coast where a few olive and fig trees were growing. The husband, Mukheimer, made no use of either the land or the trees. Then, in 1966, the father became employed by the government organization in the area where his daughter and her husband lived and where the land was. He asked his son-in-law to give him the right to use the land for one pound a year. Mukheimer, who at that time worked part-time for the same government organization as a driver, refused. The reason was that his job with the government made it possible for him to apply for a power pump to be installed over the Roman well that existed on the land, and he intended to utilize the land himself. All attempts to convince Hukheimer to let him use the land failed. Then one day Mukheimer came back to his tent to find that his father-in-law had taken his wife and the youngest child and left the other three children with the second wife. The father-in-law told the second wife to inform Mukheimer that if he wanted his wife and child back, he had to think about the land he wanted to take possession of. Mukheimer tried to discuss the matter with his father-in-law, buth the latter refused to see him. After a month there were rumors that the daughter was not happy that her father had taken her away from her husband and children and that she wanted to go back to her family. She asked a number of people to help her, including myself, since her father was one of my informants at that time; but he insisted that the only way Mukheimer could have his wife and child back was by giving him the rights to the land. Mukheimer, on the other hand, threatened to divorce his wife and marry another woman if his father-in-law did not return his wife.

593 606 559 586 [114] The case persisted for more than two months with no sign that either party was willing to give into the demands of the other. I left the area before any solution to the case was achieved.

584 578 606 [594] Another relevant case is one which involved a dispute between Hassan Hassanein from the Sanagrah tribe and the father-in-law of his daughter who was also from the same tribe and who lived in the same area. The case started when Hassanein was visited by a friend from the Zsheibat tribe in Matruh, an old man of 60 or 70 years. During the night that this guest spent at Hassanein's house, they got to talking about marriage and the fact that although his guest was a wealthy and respected man, he had only one wife. After a lengthy talk, it seemed that the old man was convinced that he should have a second wife and asked Hassanein if he knew of a suitable girl to marry. Hassanein suggested his daughter's sister-in-law. Hassanein took the prospective groom to the tent of his daughter's father-in-law and discussed the matter with the father of the prospective bride who agreed to marry his daughter to Hassanein's guest if he paid the sume of 200 pounds, in addition to slaughtering a number of goats and presenting him with the appropriate presents. When the man agreed to the terms, the fatha was read to signify the agreement between the two parties. Hassanein left the man to spend the night in the camp of his future in-laws. In the morning the groom told the bride's father that he must go to nearby Alexandria to bring the money for the bride price. When he came back late that afternoon, he paid the money and set a date for the wedding the next Thursday and then left for Matruh to prepare for the arrival of the new wife.

584 583 578 606 [595] [599]

584 578 606 686 Two days after the groom left, the bride's father (who is at the same time Hassanein's daughter's father-in-law) came to Hassanein and told him that the marriage was called off and that he should send a letter to the groom telling him the news. The reasons given by the bride's father were that the groom showed improper manners when he stayed overnight at the camp and that he followed the prospective bride to the water well to have a close look at her. He gave the money to Hassanein and asked him to return it to the man in Matruh. Hassanein was very disappointed and considered this an insult to him, since he was the mediator in that marriage, and insisted that the bride's father go on with the marriage. When the latter refused, Hassanein went to his daughter and ordered her to leave with him. Her husband was there and could not refuse to let her go with her father, even when Hassanein made it clear that her husband could not have her back unless his father kept his agreement with Hassanein's guest. Elewah, the daughter's husband, asked for a mi'ad to discuss the matter with his father-in-law. The mi'ad was held in Hassanein's house and was attended by Hassanein, his son-in-law, and two people from a different lineage, each selected by one of the disputing parties. Hassanein refused to give any reason for taking his daughter away from her husband except that he was exercising his rights. Eleway, on the other hand, insisted that Hassanein was not justified in his actions and that it was not right to punish him for something that his father did. The two representatives tried to calm both parties and to reach an agreement but were not successful. The mi'ad dissolved with Hassanein not only insisting on keeping his daughter, but also threatening to marry her to a rich man in the area. The case was not solved by the time I left the field.

S: Peters E-5 (1948-1950) 1967 MT9 Libyan Bedouin MT9
Cyrenaica

121 613 682 674 829 604 121 613 604 [554] [582] [584] [429] [422] [583] 121 613 606 121 613

kill within this range is, in terms of the general pattern of behaviour, stupid. What is of interest is that such killings do occur. I recorded three instances of men killing the mother's brother in the contemporary population, not to mention many others based on hearsay evidence only. Clearly, the relationship is more than a merely permissive one. The mother's brother may well be the only person who can help in certain crises, and if he withholds his assistance the sister's son is left in a dilemma. The form of behaviour in which demands are made is, as the Bedouin rightly say, that of asking a favour, but this does not mean that it is any the less urgent than a demand made against agnates. The range of favours is large, and only a few can be detailed here. If a group has insufficient water to meet its needs a man first seeks help from his mother's brother. The request has a number of aspects to it: it is a test of the relationship itself; it is a matter of pride and status that a man can 'call' on another to help his group out of difficulties, it is an assurance that resources other than those jealously guarded by his agnates are available to him, and if a man is seeking to increase his power he must have available more than an agnate's share of local water resources to supply his flocks and herds. When a blood-money payment has to be made, the mother's brother is expected to come forward—it is his right to give without being asked. If a man wants a wife, he is not permitted to approach his father directly, but his mother's brother can put pressure on the father instead. If a man dies while his eldest son is still a minor, his brother may be required to act as guardian, and in this role he controls the son's property; disputes frequently break out as a result, with the son at a considerable disadvantage, for he cannot engage his father's brother in hostilities—but his mother's brother can do so for him. Whenever men come to possess animals before the demise of their fathers or when the father's brother is acting as guardian they mark them with the tribal and personal signs of their mothers' brothers. Men have the right to demand contributions for bridewealth from their agnates if they lack wealth; in practice it comes not from them, but from the mother's brother. Finally, in certain circumstances, if a man does not have male heirs, his sister's son might inherit all his wealth.

Affinity also carries with it a large number of rights. A poor man may take up residence in the camp of his father-in-law, and be kept by him. The latter may come to his son-in-law's aid in many of his dealings with his father. Like the mother's brother, the affine is a potential source of water-supply when rain has been insufficient on the homeland. He also helps with blood money and bridewealth, and he is expected to aid his daughter and her husband with gifts of food and wool.

121 613

The details given above by no means exhaust the list of rights a man possesses in his matrilateral and affinal relatives. Obviously, these are not the only forms of relationship either, and the other forms carry with them yet other claims of various sorts. Enough detail has been given, however, to make clear the point that local agnatic groups are so differentiated, and inter-group relationships are so important, that each aspect of homicide settlement previously described will require further examination, not in the sense that additional complications must be introduced, but with the question in mind, is not the structural presentation false? Before beginning this stage of the argument it is necessary to establish the fact that the links of affinity and matrilaterality which a group has with another are of a kind which necessitate their inclusion in an analysis of the arrangements for settling homicides.

Cases

The Meaning of Marriage

581 Until marriage the changes in a man's life have been in the nature of
585 an ordered sequence of development from a child to be cared for — the only
342 time in his life when a father, without inhibition, showers on him his love
[593] and affection — to one who, by degrees, makes an increasing contribution to a production unit. Marriage necessitates that a man pitch a tent for himself. With a tent he becomes a potential host and protector of others. The local idiom for marriage is "to set up a tent." It would be quite improper to use
[196] the verb "to marry" when inquiring whether a marriage has taken place
[195] since this verb also has the meaning of "to have sexual intercourse." Instead the euphemism, "Have you pitched a tent?" is used. The Arabic word for a tent in this context is *Bait*. It is not used to refer to a military tent, nor to the small tent which shelters only a widow. It is reserved for the Bedouin tent, which usually has a wool top, and, most importantly, holds the promise of the continuation of life, whether it shelters a newly married couple, a mature family or young unmarried people. (The word *Bait* represents a complex concept, and it would be too much of a diversion here to discuss the various points of its significance. It is essential to understand that its
[178] meaning is not confined to a tent in the physical sense.) Its top has *Baraka* (divine goodness) in it; the quality of *Haram*, which makes it possible for the tent to be used as a sanctuary, is associated with it and this quality of *Haram* extends, moreover, to the ropes of the tent, so that anyone who clutches them comes under the protection of the owner. In it, the wife must permanently reside and her husband has the legal right to insist on this. In it too, he has the legal right of sexual access to a woman, his wife. Any children
[885] born in it he can claim as his own. With the erection of a tent the son reaches adulthood, and it is in this sense that he can be said to have acquired a domain of his own.

581 Marriage gives a son greater freedom and less dependence on his father
585 in another sense. A second euphemism used for marriage is "making a
[593] relationship," specifically an affinal one. Relationships between a man and
[195] his father-in-law are diverse and are used in various ways in different situations. Here, the particular aspect which needs to be stressed is that a man
606 can cajole his father-in-law, and (through his wife) wealth, in the form
425 of animals, may pass from the former to the latter. Reciprocal gifts are passed
556 between affines on certain occasions, but in addition small amounts may pass which are not connected with the formal occasions of exchanges. Debt
583 lies between them. It begins with the initiation of marriage negotiations,
584 when the suitor's kinsmen take a prescribed number of sheep to present to
606 the girl's father if negotiations are successful. They promise to transfer bride-wealth[9] to the girl's father. A few weeks after the marriage, the hus-

[171] [9] I use the word "bride-wealth" because it has become so familiar in the literature, but the only similarity between the *Sahiba* of the Bedouin and the bride-wealth of

6: Peters E-5 (1948-1950) 1965 MT9 Libyan Bedouin MT9
Cyrenaica

band is required to take gifts to his mother-in-law in recognition of the fact that she nourished his wife as an infant (the literal meaning of the word used for this gift is "milk"). A return visit is made and gifts are given to the daughter. When the first child is born an animal is presented by the affines, and if the child is a male, the gift may be several sheep, or even a few camels if the father-in-law is very wealthy. Formal exchange of gifts continue, but, in addition, informal transfers are made. Moreover, if relations between a man and his father-in-law develop favourably, it is not uncommon for a young husband, during the early years of marriage, to move away from his father and pitch his tent alongside that of his father-in-law. Marriage gives a son affinal relations of his own. Affinity can alleviate the dead weight of paternal authority.

It is suggested that the crisis the marriage of a son assumes for a father is the shift it entails in the distribution of authority. This is borne out by other details in the marriage ceremony referred to earlier. Ordinarily, young men dare not sing within earshot of their senior agnates. Far from allowing obscenities, agnates of the ascending generation would not allow even a mention of women to be made by young men, in their presence. In a group consisting of young men and an agnate, I chanced to use the noun for woman and immediately my tent was cleared of all but the senior agnate. At a wedding the young men revel in their lewd songs and shout their obscenities for all to hear. The senior agnates stand aside and make a show of ignoring the proceedings. And well they may, for each marriage is a challenge to the exclusive authority they have enjoyed; each nuptial tent is an invasion of the domain of which they have been undisputed masters. Marriage is the only occasion when the men of one generation can clap and sing their defiance of an older one, and give warning of the changes which must be accommodated however great the pretence that nothing has happened.

Marriage ceremonies dramatise the clash between adjacent generations over the distribution of certain forms of authority. If this authority is as overwhelming as has been suggested, and if it is so deeply resented, how is it that life is endurable for juniors? Relationships between junior and senior agnates are so restrictive that they almost amount to what Professor Fortes has suggested I view as a form of avoidance relationships. Juniors must always defer, they must obey commands promptly, they serve their seniors, they must accept a lead when it is given and the restrictions on conversations exclude all reference to women, marriage or sex. These are not simply a set of general guides for behaviour, they are rigidly applied rules, deviation from which is countered with rebuke or greater severity. It would appear from this

---

many African societies is that wealth is transferred. Obviously, in societies where the rules of exogamy compel a dispersion of links outside a man's own clan, what is involved in this transfer of wealth cannot be sociologically similar to one in which marriage to the first cousin on either side is permitted.